



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MAKING AND THE USE OF A VERBAL CONCORDANCE

A concordance, as we learn from Sir James Murray, is, in general, an agreement or harmony; more particularly, in the art of music, an agreeable or satisfactory blending of sounds or notes. Further on in his great Dictionary, we observe that the name of "concordance" is also applied to "an alphabetical arrangement of the principal words in a book, with citations of the passages in which they occur." In its application to the art of letters has the metaphor from music lost all its vitality? Let us hope it has not. In those books for which concordances now exist—the King James Bible, for instance—the words have a value for the ear as well as the eye, a significance as musical sounds which their arrangement in alphabetical order may even render more obvious. One is tempted to call the Oxford Dictionary itself (which, among its varied functions, to some extent serves as a concordance to parts of our earlier literature) an agreeable and satisfactory ordering of the significant sounds or verbal notes in the English language. This gigantic yet delicate framework may, indeed, be likened to a mighty harp, of innumerable strings, from which the bards of our race in the future will draw a music befitting the strength and purity of a world-wide English civilization. That is, we may describe a lexicon not only with respect to the materials of which it is composed, but with respect to its noblest and truest function, the service of poetry. And similarly we may define a concordance of an individual poet with regard not so much to its mechanical structure as to the highest purpose it may serve. It is something more than an alphabetical contrivance for the identification of half-forgotten lines of poetry. It is the gift of Hermes to Apollo.

In brief, we may describe a verbal concordance as an instrument designed for the promotion of literary study, poetical enjoyment, and even poetical achievement. Having once been engaged in assembling the parts of such a mechanism, I shall explain the manner in which my *Concordance to Wordsworth* came into being, and then indicate, after the fashion of an

instrument-maker, not an adept upon the harp, how the finished work may be used.

The history of this concordance is to some extent involved in that of The Concordance Society, which was organized in the year 1906, for some such reasons as follow. The assertion has often been made that the best of our modern poets deserve the kind of study that for generations has been lavished upon the poetry of the ancients. If the assertion be true, there is need of concerted action to provide the scholarly apparatus without which the taste and precision of classical learning cannot be reproduced in the domain of English. The first requisite to an exact and loving study of the poets is, of course, a collection of authentic texts; but here good fortune and the influence of classical and Biblical scholarship upon the editing of English masterpieces have not, after all, left so much to be desired. The next is an adequate historical dictionary of the language—which has been supplied by Sir James Murray and his coadjutors. The third requisite is a sufficient number of indexes to the thought and language of those English authors whom we are prepared to call “classic.” Here, students of English hitherto have been at a great disadvantage in comparison with their brothers in Greek and Latin.

For example, suppose one discovers that the works of Shakespeare contain no reference to the Holy Ghost, and suppose one desires to learn whether the same be true of Chaucer and Spenser. Without a verbal index, one must either trust to memory—a thing the experienced will try to avoid; or possibly be forced to read every line that Chaucer and Spenser wrote—which for the ends of the student is hopeless, since the intelligent reader will ask himself fifty such questions in an hour. How different the case when we wish to satisfy our curiosity respecting the utterances, or the lack of utterance, upon any topic in Homer or Virgil, or in fact almost any author of classic Greece and Rome. For most of them the indexing long since was adequately done; hence the critic is not tempted to use an imperfect memory and unguided intuition upon those aspects of Greek and Latin literature which can and ought to be subjected to a thorough investigation. An undergraduate once assured me that the word *God*

was rare in Wordsworth. It occurs 274 times, filling about three columns of the Concordance.

When The Concordance Society was founded, there were verbal indexes of one kind or another to a few of the minor English poets; but of the five authors whom Coleridge and Matthew Arnold ranked highest in our poetry, only two, Shakespeare and Milton, had been provided with concordances. Chaucer, Spenser, and Wordsworth still could be, and were, criticized by guess-work, save when scholars like Professor Legouis approached them. He made a concordance of his own to *The Prelude* before writing what is the best of all interpretations of this poem. There were, indeed, various signs of a growing interest in English concordances; and the purpose of the new Society was to stimulate the production of such works, to disseminate information concerning those already made, and, where possible, to furnish pecuniary assistance toward the publication of those that, being satisfactorily completed in manuscript, were likely to prove useful to scholars throughout the world. In its aims, accordingly, the Society was to be international (it has been erroneously referred to in print as the *American* Concordance Society); scholars in all lands are welcome to the privileges of membership, if they are in sympathy with its ideal of service, and are content rather to give than to receive.

The first undertaking of this body was the production of a *Concordance to Gray*, a task which, through the agreeable and harmonious joining of hands, was completed, even to the printing, with smoothness and speed. The second work to be published under similar auspices, my *Concordance to Wordsworth*, was not definitely recognized as a project of the Society until some months after the copy was ready for the printer. However, several of the members, notably the President, not only gave counsel in the planning, but shared in the labor of recording the words and quotations, and in the alphabetical arrangement of the slips. Furthermore, the editor of this second concordance was one of the original members of the Society, and was nerved to his task in part by the hope that he might do something to justify its existence. Otherwise his motive was the belief that a true lover of Wordsworth (I am not a "Wordsworthian") could

render a more vital service to English literature by the unambitious toil of indexing the works of that poet than by writing enthusiastic essays upon their merits. In reality, to form a concordance of Wordsworth is almost the same thing as making the poet write literary essays about himself—an object well worth the zeal of any scholar or learned organization.

Experience with the verbal indexes to Gray and Wordsworth has shown that coöperative enterprises of this nature must be planned with great circumspection, and then, at a given signal, carried through with a long breath and a steady rush. Much care must be exercised in formulating the instructions for those persons who are to record the words and quotations. These instructions, brief if possible, must at any cost be clear and specific, incapable of misinterpretation, and expressed with such energy as to command unwavering obedience. Gently, it may be, yet absolutely, they must take from the individual the power of deciding any question for himself. When they have been subjected to the criticism of authorities upon the text which is to be excerpted (to specialists like Dowden and Hutchinson in the case of Wordsworth), it is well to submit them to the scrutiny of men experienced in compiling vocabularies and other works of reference. And finally, it is well if some less experienced hand make a working test of the instructions with the words in fifty lines or so of poetry.

The preliminaries, then, demand more thought and imagination than they who are unskilled in concordances might suppose. The choice of a basic text, for example, is not to be made at random. Fortunately, in the Oxford Wordsworth, Hutchinson had provided a handy volume, with a scrupulously faithful text, which readily lent itself to the necessary cutting and pasting. Sixteen copies of this book were parted and combined in such a way that there might be eight complete sets of the odd and eight of the even pages, when the alternate sides of the leaves were neglected. Commonly out of the eight or ten words in a line of poetry, four or five are *a's*, *the's*, *of's*, or *and's*; and four or five are significant words to be recorded, as *long*, *halloos*, *screams*, *echoes*, *loud*; but even when there were eight important words in a line, the helpers with the *Concordance to Wordsworth* were able

to cut and paste the printed line on eight separate slips of paper recording the words. Where the lines can be cut out and pasted, errors of transcription are avoided, and with a little practice the work goes on with great rapidity. A list of particles and other less significant words must, of course, be compiled in advance, and the principles governing omissions duly weighed. Thus for Wordsworth it was thought better to retain a part of the quotations for certain words that are not included in the main alphabet of Strong's *Concordance of the Bible*—for instance, the pronoun *I*. Since the serene gaze of the poet often fixed itself upon the very "pulse" of his own spirit, his utterances in the first person have no ordinary fascination for those who enjoy the study of typical men. Again, though a regard for expense brought about the omission of *as*, the *Concordance to Wordsworth* (here following Strong) includes several hundred references to *like*; so that anyone taking the work in his lap, may remark with the poet:—

I sit, and play with similes.

That is, one may pass an agreeable hour recombining the harmonies that Wordsworth saw in nature.

Forethought was also required to invent 728 catchwords to indicate the titles or first lines of the poems that were to be indexed. The difficulty of this task will be understood by those who are familiar with Wordsworth's method of naming and arranging his poems, and with the attempts of certain editors to supply a few names of their own devising, and to substitute for the poet's artistic ordering of his works a chronological arrangement which, upon æsthetic grounds, he never could have sanctioned—and which never has been, or can be, fully determined. The editor of the *Concordance* is wholly in favor of a conservative treatment both of text and titles, yet strove to render the volume useful to those who are tolerant of the "chronological" as well as to those who prefer the artistic arrangement of the poems.

In the choice of collaborators the maker of a concordance must be wary. For the work on a text as extensive as that of Wordsworth, one hundred persons would not be too many to enlist—actually there were forty-six; and ten or twenty of these should be kept in reserve to fill the places of any who may drop

out. In scholarly operations that have been reduced to the exercise of strict attention and manual dexterity, women as a rule may be expected to do better work than men, though the supremely efficient are likely to be found among the latter. But, in general, anyone who by habit forms exact visual images of words—who spells correctly, as we say—may be chosen to help with a concordance, if he knows how to sweep cleanly after the fashion praised by George Herbert, that is, if his little, ameless, unremembered acts are “fine.”

Due attention must be paid to uniformity in the materials that are given to the several collaborators. In the enterprise I have been describing, each received eight copies, as already explained, of a portion of the Oxford Wordsworth (usually about twenty-two pages), and a ninth for reference; a typewritten list of abbreviated titles of the poems in his section of text; and a set of “Instructions,” also in typewriting. And each was provided with something like 5,000 slips of a uniform color (white), weight, and size ($5 \times 2\frac{1}{2}$ in.); a set of movable rubber types, a stamp to hold them, and an ink-pad; a ‘medium’ pencil; a pair of scissors; and a supply of library paste. Every item is important. It is necessary to have uniform slips for alphabetizing, and desirable to use a pencil, not a pen, for the sake of speed.

The first hundred slips that each collaborator prepared after reading the “Instructions” were submitted to the editor for his supervision. When they had been returned with corrections or advice, the work was fairly in motion. The aim was to record each word in the text (save the omitted particles, etc.); the number of the page in the Oxford Wordsworth; the verse in which the word is found; the catchword used to indicate the poem; and the number of the line—thus:—

joy

640

The bond of union between life and joy.

Prelude 1. 558

The following, as it seems to me, is the ideal method for speed and accuracy in recording the words in a typical poem, say a sonnet. Laying 70 blank slips on a table, one stamps in the upper right-hand corner of each the number of the page. Then,

in the lower right-hand corner of the first four slips, one stamps or writes the number 1, in the next four or five the number 2, and so on, four or five slips for each of the fourteen lines in the sonnet. The slips still lying (overlapping) on the table, one stamps below the middle of each slip the abbreviated title of the sonnet as found in the typewritten list. Now one gathers up the 70 slips, preserving the order of line-numbers, and on the first four, in the upper left-hand corner, writes the four words which are to be taken from the first line of the sonnet, a word to a slip; on the second four slips the four significant words from the second line; and so on; when there are five concordance-words in a line, one is likely to have an extra slip from a line where there are but three; in any case there are extra slips at hand. When all the words of the sonnet have been written in the upper left-hand corners of their respective slips, it only remains to cut out the requisite lines from the printed texts, and to paste these lines in the middle of the corresponding slips. With a longer poem, it is best to prepare the slips, and record the words, for a page at a time. Before pasting, it is convenient to cut between the lines on the printed page, leaving them attached at the centre of the page, so that they may be pulled off with the fingers, and to do this for a column of print in five different copies of the text. It might be well to have the neglected sides of the text gummed or otherwise made ready on a large scale for pasting. The secret of speed and accuracy is to perform a single operation a great many times before turning to the next, and to think out a sequence of operations which affords the easiest transitions and makes the least confusion.

Hyphenated words should be recorded in the usual way, but a cross-reference from the second element to the whole word must also be made on a separate slip, thus:—

reverted

See half-reverted.

The slips for cross-references had best be kept by themselves for special examination by the editor.

When all the words have been recorded, and all the lines pasted for twenty-two pages, say, the collaborator must check off the slips with the text which he has for reference, in order to guard

against omissions. He will then proceed to arrange his slips alphabetically (the cross-references in a separate list) before sending them to the editor. When the slips of all the collaborators have been thus separately ordered and returned, they must be combined in one main alphabet, after which the cross-references must be verified and inserted. This done, the slips should be numbered with an automatic stamp, for the convenience of the printer; and for his guidance also a set of rules must be drawn up, showing how the information on the slips is to appear in the printed book. Finally, if the reading of proof is to be done by coöperation, instructions must be devised for the guidance of the readers.

Without explaining all the details of the process, I have been thus circumstantial for the sake of any who may engage in a similar enterprise. Part of the experience gained in the making of such works can be transmitted; commonly all is lost. I may warn the prospective imitator that his undertaking in any case will not be light; yet by such means as I have outlined, a concordance that otherwise might consume half a lifetime may be begun and published in a year or two. Bartlett's *Concordance to Shakespeare* was begun in 1876; it is dated 1894. Mary Cowden Clark's concordance to the same author cost her sixteen or eighteen years. Bonitz spent twenty-five years upon his *Index Aristotelicus*; upon his *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* Strong spent thirty-five. The 210,994 slips of the *Concordance to Wordsworth* were ready for the printer in less than seven months after the signal was given to begin excerpting. Some time elapsed before the generous and high-minded firm of Smith, Elder, and Company was secured as a publisher, and then, notwithstanding the interruption of a strike, the printers, William Clowes and Sons, had sent out revises of the whole work within a year. Through the experience this work has furnished, and through a further division of the labor, a concordance to Browning, which is needed, might be excerpted in a month, alphabetically arranged in another, and printed in twelve.¹ It could be compiled and

¹These words were virtually a prediction; since they were written, a concordance has been made for Browning by Professor Leslie N. Broughton, of Cornell University, and Professor Benjamin F. Stelter, of the University

printed, I believe, for \$10,000—a sum less than the price alleged lovers of books sometimes will pay for a single old edition. “England,” said Professor Skeat, “is a country where numerous amateur workers, many of them very good ones, can be found for work of this character”; the same thing is true of America; and a man of wealth can perpetuate his name, among those who think and feel, in no better way than by advancing the funds necessary for a concordance to the poet whom he loves.

So much for the building of the instrument. What now of its function? The use of a concordance is dual. Properly interrogated, the right sort of index tells us both what the poet chose to utter, and what he unconsciously or purposely refrained from uttering. It enables us to define his subject-matter. But whether for purposes of positive or negative definition, such an oracle must be questioned with discrimination, or it will answer something wrong. For example, as Professor Jespersen says: “When Milton as a poet uses only 8,000 against Shakespeare’s 20,000 words, this is a natural consequence of the narrower range of his subjects, and it is easy to prove that his vocabulary really contained many more than the 8,000 words found in a concordance to his poetical works. We have only to take any page of his prose writings, and we shall meet with a great many words not in the concordance. The greatness of Shakespeare’s mind is . . . not shown by the fact that he was acquainted with 20,000 words, but by the fact that he wrote about so great a variety of subjects and touched upon so many human facts and relations that he needed this number of words.” There is, then, an element of chance to be considered. That Shakespeare did not use the word *Bible* may be more or less of an accident, as compared with his failure to allude to the Trinity. He does employ the expression *holy writ*.

of Southern California, with the help of many assistants. It is ready for the printer, and could be published without delay, if only a Mæcenas would offer to defray the expense. Meanwhile two other concordances, prepared by the method described in this paper, have been published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington: *A Concordance to the Works of Horace*, edited by the present writer; and *A Concordance to the Poems of John Keats*, edited by Mr. Baldwin, Professor Broughton, Mrs. Evans, Mr. Hebel, Professor Stelter, and Miss Thayer, all at one time connected with Cornell University.

In the case of Wordsworth the negative element is of the utmost importance. We know from various sources that he early determined to avoid satire, and took what measures he could to prevent the publication of his adaptations from Juvenal; that—

The gentle Lady married to the Moor,

the tragedy of *Othello*, though a theme “pre-eminently dear” to him as a reader, was the kind of subject which as a poet he steadily refused to touch, saying with a reminiscence of the Moor’s own history:—

The moving accident is not my trade;

and that he would not permit himself to represent the passion of love, for fear the violence of his emotions might cause him to overstep the bounds of art. Accordingly, the language of satire, of the battling tragic hero, or of the Sapphic or Shelleyan love-trance, is not the language of the *Concordance to Wordsworth*. The few lines that have been resurrected of his free translation of Juvenal stand out in their harshness from the rest of his poetry. As for the tragic struggle and the tragic fall, it is the inner, spiritual, not the outer, bodily motions of humanity that he constantly seeks to unfold. Physical action, he says, is “transitory”;—

Suffering is permanent, obscure, and dark,
And shares the nature of infinity.

It has been held that he was deficient in the sense of smell. If so, the Concordance might be expected to furnish very few words referring either to smell or taste. So far as I have observed, the allusions to taste are infrequent. Out of thirty occurrences of *bitter*, virtually all are figurative: *bitter insult*, *bitter loss*, and so on. *Honey* occurs six times. On the other hand, *fragrance* occurs twenty-two times, *fragrant* thirteen, *incense* and its compounds thirteen, *odours* seven, *odorous incense* two, *thyme* five. Again, it has been held that he was without humor, and certainly the language of Aristophanic comedy forms no considerable part of his vocabulary. However, it is not quite safe to affirm that the student of Cambridge who “laughed with Chaucer in the hawthorn shade”—at the *Reeve’s Tale*—, or the poet who subtly made use of Chaucer’s *House of Fame* in *Peter*

Bell, and was the sympathetic friend of Lamb, and in earlier life contended with an over-frequent tendency to smile, was wholly deficient in a sense of the ludicrous. As he read *Othello*, yet avoided what Othello calls "moving accidents," so when he modernized Chaucer, he did not select the *Reeve's Tale*. If, in spite of Book Seventh of *The Prelude* and a few shorter efforts like *The Power of Music*, subjects and language of a humorous nature are relatively lacking in the poetry of Wordsworth, the cause may be one of those numberless inhibitions which are hard to discover, simply because they are inhibitions. When the deliberate and habitual choice of an elevated subject-matter, as the action and passion of the human heart in an environment pulsating with divinity, has necessitated the rejection of many lower topics, the unwary may think that the poet is wanting in certain powers that unquestionably were his. Arnold, I believe, and doubtless Jeffrey, never formed a careful estimate of the strength of self-repression in *The White Doe of Rylstone* or *Vaudracour and Julia*. It is hard to measure the workings of restraint in others—Wordsworth knew this as well as Burns; but the Concordance would furnish abundant evidence of the quality in Wordsworth's writings, had we time to consider the evidence here. A few illustrations must suffice.

First, Wordsworth's vocabulary is rich in negatives, in words compounded with the prefixes *dis-* and *un-*; richer comparatively, where I have tested it, than Shakespeare's; much richer absolutely than Milton's. However, he does not use the same word very often. Of each of the following words, which are almost consecutive, there is but one occurrence: *unabating*, *unacceptable*, *unaccompanied*, *unadored*, *unadulterate*, *unadulterated*, *unadvisedly*, *unaffected*, *unaffecting*, *unaimed*, *unaired*, *unamused*. Yet *unambitious*, which is found in neither Milton, Burns, nor Shakespeare, occurs nine times in Wordsworth. Frequently he elects to express a positive idea by a double negative, thus:—

Not unamused.

Not unaccompanied with tuneful notes.

And for thy beauty wert not unadored.

Not unassisted by the flattering stars.

Moreover, he employs many qualifiers to diminish the force of a positive notion:—

Thou liv'st with less ambitious aim.
But, with a less ambitious sympathy.
Her skill she tried with less ambitious views.

Out of 52 hyphenated compounds in which the first element is *half*, 44 have but one quotation each. The following illustrate the delicacy of his mental operations: *half-absence*, *half-insight*, *half-reverted*, *half-slumber*, *half-suppressed*, *half-wisdom*—

And that half-wisdom half-experience gives.

But his manifest avoidance of certain words and ideas is even more significant. Notwithstanding the construction often put upon his remarks concerning the diction of *Lyrical Ballads*, the language of Wordsworth is characterized by an absence of terms that are mean and low, as his thought by an absence of mean and low ideas. Whereas the occurrences of the words *beautiful*, *beauty*, and their cognates fill over three columns, the word *ugliness* does not occur at all, and the word *ugly* but once—in the phrase *ugly witchcraft*, that is, not in the sense of “physically repulsive.” In Milton *uglier* occurs once, *ugly-headed* once, and *ugly* thrice. Shelley uses *ugly* nine times, Shakespeare twenty-four. When Wordsworth refers to what is painful or unpleasant, he is likely to use a superior word. *Repulsive*, indeed, occurs only once; but the idea which he does not admit under the term *ugly* he may under *hideous*. He uses *hideous* thirteen times; Milton uses it fifteen, Shakespeare twenty, Shelley twenty-two.

It has been intimated that statistics of this order must be interpreted with caution. Neither *hideous* nor *ugly* is recorded in the canonical books of the Authorized Version, although the Bible does not lack the corresponding ideas. Yet that Wordsworth should have written *ugly* but once, *repulsive* but once, and *unlovely* but twice, is characteristic of his aims in composition. *Dirt*, *dirty*, *filth*, *filthy*, *slime*, *slimy*, and *hog*, all, or nearly all of them, one may find in Shakespeare, Milton, and Shelley; Milton uses all but *dirty*. Only one of them is found in the poetry of Wordsworth:—

Upon the slimy foot-stone I espied
The useless fragment;

and this is the sole occurrence.

If the characteristic thus negatively displayed fails to harmonize with the theory of poetic diction commonly ascribed to Wordsworth, there may be several reasons. First there is Lord Jeffrey. It will be recalled that the *Poems in Two Volumes*, of 1807, contain a large proportion of the verse selected by Matthew Arnold for his Wordsworthian anthology. But Lord Jeffrey in his time had said that the diction of those two volumes had "nowhere any pretensions to elegance or dignity." And people who had little acquaintance with the history of words believed him when he declared that a kind of ode "to the Daisy" was "very flat, feeble, and affected," and that "further on we find an *Ode to Duty*, in which the lofty vein is very unsuccessfully attempted." Nowadays, when they hear that the *Ode to Duty* was thought by Professor T. H. Green to be "the high-water mark of modern poetry," people are ready to believe that too. Next, the language of the poet had its own individual development. The Concordance represents the final stage. Says Hutchinson: "With the revision of 1845 the textual history of Wordsworth's minor poems may be said virtually to close. The course of that history is pithily described by Professor Dowden: 'Boldness,' he writes, 'in these readings was followed by tameness [1827], by infelicity [1836-7], and, finally, by felicity' [1845; 1849-50]." Thirdly, the critics of Wordsworth have generally dwelt upon one source of his language, namely men in actual life, and paid little or no attention to the principles, for he must have had them, by which he selected and "purified" the elements of his medium of expression. I do not recall that he explicitly states what his standard of selection was, even where he mentions his having abstained from the use of many expressions, in themselves proper and beautiful, "which have been foolishly repeated by bad poets." But his practice is clear. When anyone objected to his usage, for example, to the word *caroused* in *Ruth*—

her cup of wrong
She fearfully caroused,—

he instantly defended it upon historical grounds, supporting his contention with examples, from Spenser and the Elizabethan dramatists down, in a way that would cheer Dr. Bradley and Professor Skeat. It was not probable, he thought, that the

ordinary reader would be so familiar as the poet with the changes of meaning that words have undergone. Doubtless he would have found a use for the *Concordance to Gray*, who, as Wordsworth says, "was more than any other man curiously elaborate in the structure of his own poetic diction"; for no oracle can reveal so much of the history of words as a series of concordances to the poets.

We are turning from the negative to the positive functions of such works. Positively, from a study of the alphabetical list, Wordsworth's diction may be described as elevated, and chosen for its musical quality, as well as its general intelligibility, from elements of speech that had been in use from the time of Spenser to his own day. If words may be classified like men, according to their nobility, as average, or below or above the average, his language is found to be consistently above the average. It is pure, clear, dignified, and musical. In his treatise *On the Sublime and Beautiful*, Burke says: "It is hard to repeat certain sets of words, though owned by themselves unoperative, without being in some degree affected; especially if a warm and affecting tone of voice accompanies them, as suppose,—

Wise, valiant, generous, good, and great."

It is hard to read the passages containing any one of these in the Concordance—for they are all Wordsworthian—without being in some degree affected. No page of this work will leave the lover of good English cold.

The musical quality of Wordsworth's lines, though positive, is not obtrusive. It must not be thought that he gave either too little heed, or too much, to this aspect of his art. In a letter to Mrs. Clarkson, he writes: "To you I will whisper that *The Excursion* has one merit if it has no other, viz. variety of musical effect." And to R. P. Gillies he says: "If you write more blank verse, pay particular attention to your versification, especially as to the pauses on the first, second, third, eighth, and ninth syllables. These pauses should never be introduced for convenience, and not often for the sake of variety merely, but for some especial effect of harmony or emphasis." He makes no extravagant use of alliteration.

the average number of quotations to a word be estimated at seven, this is due to the fact that a few important words are used so often as to occupy several columns, frequently several pages. Taking a page at random, however, I find an average of not quite five quotations to a word. In general, then, he does not employ the same word many times. *Excursion* occurs once in the singular and once in the plural, but not in the poem of that name. *Drift* occurs twice, *juice* once, *label* once, *liturgy* once (not in the 1848 lines of the *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, but in *The White Doe of Rylstone*); *Africa* twice, *Asia* twice, *Australian* once, *America* twice, *American* once. Wordsworth mentions his own surname twice, that of Coleridge thrice, and the names of other poets as follows: Chatterton (1), Horace (3), Chaucer (4), Burns (5), Spenser (6), Shakespeare (10), Milton (15). Homer, Virgil, and Gray are each referred to once, Virgil, a favorite of Wordsworth, only in *Virgilian*. It frequently happens that the subject of a poem, after appearing in the title, is not mentioned by name in the text. Occasional reiterated phrases, like those in *The Thorn*, can often be explained in a special way. *The Thorn* is supposed to be a story told by a garrulous sea-captain.

Where the interests of the poet are the deep interests of humanity, we may expect to find the great simple words of the language again and again appearing. *Nature* and *natural*, of course, occur a great many times in Wordsworth, sometimes in less familiar combinations, as—

or— To watch crude Nature work in untaught minds ;
or— If simple Nature trained by careful Art ;
or— From the great Nature that exists in works
Of mighty Poets ;

but the words *mind* and *man* and *human* are still more frequent. Some persons may be astonished at this greater frequency, having been accustomed to think of him as the poet of external rather than human nature. To these I can only say that the proportion is strictly in keeping with the lines in which he calls *The Mind of Man*—

My haunt, and the main region of my song,

with the substance of most of his poems, and with the Aristotelian dictum concerning the proper objects of poetical representation. In fact, the large words in the Concordance are not those that represent the objects of the senses, the analytic operations of the intellect, or even the commoner of the less admirable passions, so much as those that stand for the universal activities of the imagination, and the great structural emotions, if I may so term them, of human life. *Life, living, power, heart, and love* are among the richer words; there is no space here to discuss the poetical vision of conduct that gleams among his utterances under these and their cognates. But let us take one definition. We live, says Wordsworth, in a passage that the maker of a concordance may justly appropriate—

We live by Admiration, Hope, and Love.

We die, or contract our lives, then, by disparagement, fear, and hate. The numerical comparison of such words reveals that Wordsworth, a constructive artist, though he arouses all the chief emotions in his reader, still maintains the supremacy of *life* over *death*, *praise* over *blame*, *hope* over *fear*, *love* over *hate*. It is not accidental that the word *hate* occurs 23 times, and *love* 761, or that *spirit* occurs four times as often as *body*. *Fear* may be salutary as well as destructive; it occurs 255 times. *Suspicion* occurs 5 times, *envy* 24, *anger* 28; *joy* 356, *hope* 404. *Nature* occurs 395 times, *nature's* 152, *natural* 101; *human* 294, *men* 324, *soul* 401, *mind* 540, *man* 696. *Bad* occurs 19 times, *evil* 79, *miserable* 25, *wretched* 36; *happy* 257, *good* 396. These figures, however crude, serve to show what Wordsworth means by—

The bond of union between life and joy.

Space fails for a consideration of endless topics upon which the Concordance would throw abundant light; upon *pulse, impulse, machine, machinery*, as Wordsworth applies them to human and to what we should call inorganic nature; upon his distinction, exploited by De Quincey, between the literature of "knowledge" and the literature of "power"; upon the relations between "fancy" and "imagination"; upon the much larger number of references to the eye, and slightly larger to *see* and *seen*, than, respectively,

to the ear, and to *hear* and *heard*; upon the delicacy of perception evinced by a succession of words like—

Glance, glanced, glances, glancing, glare, glared, glares, glaring, glassed, glassy, glazed, glead, gleam, gleamed, gleaming, dim-gleaming, dimly-gleaming, mildly-gleaming, gleams, gleamy, glimmer, glimmered, glimmering, glimmerings, glimmers, glimpse, glimpses, glinted, glisten, glistened, glistening, glistenings, glistens, glistered, glistening, glitter, glittered, glittering, thickly-glittering, glitters, gloom, gloomier, gloomiest, glooms, gloomy, gloss, glossy, glow;

or upon the way in which Wordsworth's shorter poems are vitally connected with his longer, so that we cannot fully understand—

She was a Phantom of delight,

without consulting another reference to his wife—

She came, no more a phantom—

which is in *The Prelude*. Wordsworth himself explicitly tells us that his briefer works are related to *The Prelude* and *The Excursion* as the little cells, oratories, and sepulchral recesses of a Gothic church to the apse and body of the structure. No labor could be more fascinating, or more rewarding, than the search for these relations in his poetry, yet no aspect of his genius has been more steadily ignored than the constructive power this study reveals. But a more important subject still is his increasing, or gradually intenser, sympathy with traditional religion as the great poetical effort of the English imagination. A certain Patty Smith, the type of all shallow readers, "talks," said he, "of my being a worshipper of Nature. A passionate expression, uttered incautiously in the poem upon the Wye, has led her into this mistake; she, reading in cold-heartedness, and substituting the letter for the spirit. Unless I am greatly mistaken, there is nothing of this kind in *The Excursion*. . . . Whence does she gather that the author of *The Excursion* looks upon Nature and God as the same?" It is in dealing with such problems that the Concordance may become most helpful.

Space fails also for a consideration of the similes grouped under the word *like*. Here the Concordance has nine columns of reading-

matter not so very much less disconnected than Shelley's ode *To a Skylark*. Seven of the lines in Shelley's ode begin with *like*, yet there is no necessary order in his comparisons. Is it jocular to remark that the similes in the Concordance were not left to welter in a chaos of unpremeditated chance? There is at least a mechanical reason for their sequence, though at first glance the effect may not always seem highly poetical.

Nevertheless the Concordance was designed for the service of poetry, and for the fit though few who can properly use it. As Hermes, the keen-sighted, the patron of all students of literature, could find no better gift for Apollo, the god of poetry and friend of the Muses, than a humble instrument made of reeds and cords, a piece of leather, and a tortoise-shell, so the scholar can bring no gift more welcome to the poet and the friend of Mnemosyne than the simple instrument here described. Yet the scholar may say to the ideal student of poetry, as Hermes to Apollo:—

To those who are unskilled in its sweet tongue,
 Though they should question most impetuously
 Its hidden soul, it gossips something wrong—
 Some senseless and impertinent reply.
 But thou who art as wise as thou art strong
 Canst compass all that thou desirest. I
 Present thee with this music-flowing shell,
 Knowing thou canst interrogate it well.

LANE COOPER.

Cornell University.